P. J. FINGLASS

THE ENDING OF SOPHOCLES' *OEDIPUS REX*

In 2001 Roger Dawe argued that the ending of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* found in our manuscripts was an interpolation, beginning at 1424[1]. Although he was not the first to do so, no-one had previously argued the case with such thoroughness and force. Five years later, he deleted this passage in the second edition of his commentary on the play. His case against the lines is based on an assessment of the dramatic quality of the passage (or rather, its lack of it), and on a series of alleged linguistic problems. In this article I set out why I disagree with Dawe's decision. I concentrate on the second part of his case: not because arguments from dramatic technique are irrelevant, but rather because they can be refuted through reference to existing publications[2], whereas there is no published defence of the ending from a linguistic point of view. In an appendix examining previous scholarship on this passage, I show that the deletion was first canvassed more than a century before the scholars to whom it is currently attributed, and from an unexpected source.

I am grateful to Mr David Butterfield, Professor Christopher Collard, and Professor Bernd Seidensticker for helpful comments.

[1] There are no relevant papyri. Dawe's article, together with two others which I cite below, is reprinted in Dawe (2007), but at the time of my final pre-publication revisions (June 2008) there were still no copies of this book available in UK university libraries (according to http://copac.ac.uk/).

[2] See especially Davies (1982); also Davies (1991) 7-18 and Budelmann (2006) (where see 45 n. 1 for a list of other recent contributions).

No scholar known to me has expressed agreement with Dawe's position, at least in print. A refutation might thus be thought unnecessary, or even self-indulgent[3]. I have chosen to attempt one for four reasons. First, Dawe's contribution to the textual criticism of Sophocles is second to none among living scholars: his views thus command *prima facie* respect and deserve close examination, especially when they concern linguistic detail. Second, Dawe has himself complained that scholars who defend the authenticity of the ending argue on purely literary and dramatic terms, and fail to take account of philological arguments[4]. He makes it clear that, for him, it is the latter which are crucial[5]; and indeed, the most recent critic to discuss the problem, while not accepting Dawe's overall case, nevertheless asserts that his linguistic arguments need answering[6]. This

[3] Cf. Davies (1982) 278 n. 26: "This theory ... has found scant favour with the majority of scholars. I have therefore been prevailed upon not to follow the easy but probably otiose course of appending a lengthy and predictable refutation of it to the present article." But already by 1991 the growing suspicion in some quarters concerning the end of the play led him to publish a defence of its authenticity.

[4] As at Dawe (2001) 11 n. 15: "Like so many defenders of authenticity, Gellie does not dirty his hands with philological detail."

[5] Dawe (2001) 11: "Purely literary arguments may supplement these reasons, but cannot refute them". *Ibid.* 20: "The end of *Oedipus Rex* has been extensively refashioned from 1423 onwards, and the proof of this lies in its often maladroit writing."

[6] Budelmann (2006) 58: "the detailed fresh *linguistic* arguments he puts forward deserve detailed responses. My own view is that Dawe has made a strong case for a number, possibly even an abnormally high number, of problematic phrases in the last section of the play …"

throws down a gauntlet which I, for one, am happy to take up[7]. Third, his edition of the play, which still provides the only recent commentary on it in English, is likely to have a wide circulation, especially for teaching purposes[8]. It may be convenient for people teaching the play to have a statement of a contrary view, so that their pupils may examine both positions before making up their minds. Fourth, although no-one has come out in support of Dawe's case, reservations about the authenticity of parts of the ending have been expressed by a minority of scholars in recent years[9]. Moreover, such reservations can be found far earlier in the academic literature than is currently acknowledged, as I explore in the Appendix to this article[10].

Dawe conveniently sets out his linguistic objections on pages 3-11 of his 2001 article. Almost all of these make their way into the 2006 commentary, where he adds a few more. I consider them now in order of their appearance in the play. To avoid a stream of unnecessary references, I only specify the location of a given objection if Dawe does not express it in both the article and the commentary. I also avoid stating when and where Dawe's arguments have been anticipated by other scholars. It will be easier to set that out

[7] Indeed, I have already done so by asserting, without argument, in my review of Dawe's commentary (Finglass (2007) 276) that "The linguistic difficulties which Dawe additionally alleges are unlikely to trouble a reader who has not already determined to delete the passage on other grounds."

[8] The back cover of the paperback declares that book is intended for "classical scholars, undergraduates, and students in the upper forms of schools".

[9] So Hester (1977) 46, Hester (1984), March (1987) 148-54.

[10] When Davies (1991, 1 n. 4) writes that "opponents of the end of the *OT*'s authenticity have hardly read up on each other", his words are truer than he realises.

diachronically in the Appendix, while concentrating in the main body of the article on the case made by Dawe, which is considerably fuller than any previous account.

Kr. ou0x w(j gelasth/j, Oi0di/pouj, e0lh/luqa,
ou0d' w(j o0neidiw~n ti tw~n pa/roj kakw~n.
a0ll' ei0 ta\ qnhtw~n mh\ kataisxu/nesq' e1ti
ge/neqla, th\n gou=n pa/nta bo/skousan flo/ga
ai0dei=sq' a1naktoj 9Hli/ou . . . (1422-6)

Dawe objects to the transition between 1423 and 1424, where, after first speaking to Oedipus, Creon turns to his attendants without a vocative to mark the new addressees. But compare the following passage (*Phil.* 1052-5), spoken by Odysseus:

nika=n ge me/ntoi pantaxou= xrh|&zwn e1fun,
plh\n e0j se/: nu=n de\ soi/ g' e9kw_n e0ksth/somai.
a1fete ga\r au0to/n, mhde\ prosyau/sht' e1ti.
e0a=te mi/mnein. ou0de\ sou= prosxrh|&zomen ...

At the start Odysseus is addressing Philoctetes; then at 1054-5 he gives three commands to his henchmen who are holding him, before returning to Philoctetes at the end of 1055. No ambiguity results, any more than in our passage. In both cases the addressee is so obvious, and the order so urgent, that an otiose vocative would detract from the immediacy of the situation.

The content of Creon's speech also offends Dawe, in that he makes "uncalled-for censorious remarks about [the attendants'] apparent lack of respect for what he is pleased to call the qnhtw~n ge/neqla". But this ignores the dramatic function of the new king's

abruptness. Creon's forthright address to the attendants contrasts with the studied politeness of his words to Oedipus. He does not, as he might have done, mock Oedipus for his reversal of fortune: but the force of his commands to his subordinates underlines the gravity of the situation, and stresses that we (or Oedipus) should not mistake his restraint for weakness. As for qnhtw~n ge/neqla, Dawe's manner of expression suggests that he finds the phrase objectionable; but as he does not say why, I do not need to defend it. The onus is on him to explain why this is not Sophoclean, when e.g. *El.* 128 w} ge/neqla gennai/wn is.

Oi. pro\j qew~n, e0pei/per e0lpi/doj m' a0pe/spasaj,
a1ristoj e0lqw_n pro\j ka/kiston a1ndr' e0me/,
piqou= ti/ moi: (1432-4)

Dawe (2006) complains that "the verb a0pe/spasaj, 'torn away from', is oddly forcible, and does not appear to suit the context, one of appreciation of kindly condescension ... And what 'hope' was Oedipus entertaining anyway?" e0lpi/j here is not "hope" but "expectation" (so rightly Jebb, Lloyd-Jones; cf. my note on *El.* 1282), referring to Oedipus' belief that he was so polluted that Creon would not wish to encounter him. The forcible verb a0pe/spasaj, together with the juxtaposed superlatives in 1433, make clear the extent of his self-loathing by emphasising Creon's generosity in coming to meet such a man. It also makes rhetorical sense: Oedipus is about to make a request of Creon, so he praises Creon's actions in the strongest terms available to him. I do not see where Dawe's idea of "kindly condescension" comes from. For the construction, with a0pospa/w taking a personal object accompanied by an abstract

genitive of separation, cf. Ar. *Ran.* 961-2 a0ll 0 ou0k e0kompola/koun | a0po\ tou= fronei=n a0pospa/saj (sc. au0tou/j); it is found in reverse at *El.* 809-10.

Oi. kai\ soi/ g' e0piskh/ptw te kai\ protre/yomai[11] (1446)

Dawe objects to the combination of tenses and to the g 0. He advocates a lacuna at the start of Oedipus' speech, immediately before this line. For the combination of tenses Schneidewin (in his 2nd edition, of 1853) compares Thuc. 2.44.1 ou0k o0lofu/romai ma=llon h2 paramuqh/somai (later cited by Jebb, who translates "I *do not* bewail them, but rather *intend to* comfort them"); cf. Kühner–Gerth i. 172-3 and *Tr.* 216 ai1romai (Lloyd-Jones: a0ei/rom 0 codd.) ou0d' a0pw&somai, which also refers to actions which are essentially simultaneous. As for kai\ ... ge, Jebb's explanation of the emphasis which it gives appears unproblematic: "as I turn to the god for what he alone can give ... so I turn to *thee* for that which lies in thine own power."

Oi. a0ll' e1a me nai/ein o1resin, e1nqa klh|/zetai
ou9mo\j Kiqairw_n ou[toj, o4n mh/thr te/ moi
path/r t' e0qe/sqhn zw~nti[12] ku/rion ta/fon,
i3n' e0c e0kei/nwn, oi3 m' a0pwllu/thn, qa/nw.

[11] For the choice of this verb over the variant pros– see Davies (1982) 275 n. 17, cited with approval by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990) 112.

[12] So Pa, *coni.* Pierson and printed by Dawe, who shows why it must be right in (1973-8) i. 263-4. Like other editors, he ascribes the conjecture to Toup, but Johannes Pierson anticipates him in an unpublished work: see Finglass (2009) 205.

kai/toi tosou=to/n g' oi]da, mh/te m' a2n no/son 1455

mh/t' a1llo pe/rsai mhde/n: ou0 ga\r a1n pote

qnh|&skwn e0sw&qhn, mh\ 'pi/ tw| deinw|~ kakw|~. (1451-7)

Dawe believes that this passage is by Sophocles, with the exception of 1454, which he deletes. He argues (2001, 5) that "The kai/toi connection ... is inexplicable unless it follows 1453 (the grave) and refers back to the time when Oedipus was exposed as an infant on the moutain." This is not the place to explore in full the vexed question of whether 1455-7 refer to Oedipus' past or his future. But it seems to me that the latter is more likely, since the passage is surrounded by lines which refer to the future: i3n' e0c e0kei/nwn, oi3 m' a0pwllu/thn, qa/nw (1454) and a0ll' h9 me\n h9mw~n moi=r', o3poiper ei]s', i1tw (1458). Far from being 'inexplicable', kai/toi fits this context admirably: after 1454 Oedipus immediately corrects himself, boldly asserting that his extraordinary life to date suggests that he will die in no ordinary fashion.

Dawe also complains that "the idea that turning out the helpless king onto Mt Cithaeron would make Laius and Jocasta his killers after all is highly artificial." It is no more "artificial" than Tiresias' earlier words to Oedipus h3d' h9me/ra fu/sei se kai\ diafqerei= (438, a line on which Dawe offers no comment). This day does not literally bring Oedipus to birth; rather, it reveals the nature of that birth. So in our passage Oedipus' death on Cithaeron would not literally be at the hands of his parents, but it would fulfil the intention that they conceived years ago.

Oi. tai=n d' a0qli/ain oi0ktrai=n te parqe/noin e0mai=n,

ai[n ou1poq' h9mh\ xwri\j e0sta/qh bora=j

tra/pez' a1neu tou=d' a0ndro/j, a0ll' o3swn e0gw_

yau/oimi, pa/ntwn tw&d' a0ei\ meteixe/thn: (1462-5)

Dawe complains that "It is strange that Oedipus should stress how close he was to his daughters by pointing out that he never sat at a separate table." This underestimates the symbolic importance of commensality. It is remarkable that Oedipus, though a king, should make sure that his (mere) children always enjoy the privilege of dining with him.

He also objects to the construction, saying that "from whom my dining table was never set apart without me" is an "unhappy amalgam" of "their table was never set apart from me" and "my table was never set apart from them". This makes the sentence appear more complicated than it is. Take ai[n as a dative marking the interested party (so rightly Ellendt (1872) s.v. xwri/j), and xwri/j as an adverb, meaning "separately". This adverb is then amplified and specified by the addition of a1neu tou=d' a0ndro/j. Compare how a word meaning "alone" or similar is "often ... accompanied by a further phrase emphasising and defining the solitude" (my note on *El.* 36, with further examples). This interpretation gives clearer sense and is truer to the word order: xwri/j no longer has to vault backwards over the preceding h9mh/ to reach ai[n.

Dawe complains that bora/ is an inappropriate word for human nourishment, and that tra/peza bora=j "a table of food" is "just about unknown in classical Greek". But for the word used as an unexceptionable term for food cf. Eur. *Ion* 1169, *El.* 425, 429, *IT* 973, *Or.* 189. Even at *Phil.* 274 the term could itself be neutral, the scarcity of Philoctetes' provisions being denoted by the ti. As for the syntactic objection, Barrett notes (on Eur. *Hipp.* 952-5, p. 344) that "bora/, though often a synonym of 'food', is

properly the *nomen actionis* of bibrw/skw.” In his note on Eur. *Hipp.* 802 he accordingly translates our phrase as “table for feeding” (cf. Lloyd-Jones’s “the table where I ate”). If (to take the passages cited by Barrett) Aesch. *Ag.* 1437 a0spi\j qra/souj “a shield which provides confidence”, Eur. *Or.* 1203 swthri/aj e1palcin “a rampart which provides safety”, and (most significantly) Eur. *Hipp.* 802 bro/xon ... a0gxo/nhj “a noose for hanging oneself” are all possible tragic locutions, why not tra/peza bora=j “a table for eating”?

Oi. ai[n moi me/lesqai: kai\ ma/lista me\n xeroi=n
yau=sai/ m' e1ason ka0poklau/sasqai kaka/. (1466-7)

Dawe translates “Look after them, and for preference let me touch them”, which he says is “perilously close to nonsense”. Lloyd-Jones’s rendering is “Care for them! And if you can, let me touch them”, but ma/lista does not mean “if you can”. Rather, Oedipus follows the general request ai[n moi me/lesqai with another, which is more specific and reflects Oedipus’ more immediate desire. For ma/lista attached to the second of a pair of imperatives cf. *Tr.* 799-800 a0ll' a]ron e1cw, kai\ ma/lista me/n me qe\j | e0ntau=q' o3pou me mh/ tij o1yetai brotw~n, Jebb on *OR* 926; also Schwyzer–Debrunner ii. 414(d) for ma/lista marking “what I most desire”.

Oi. i1q' w}nac,
i1q' w} gonh|~ gennai=e. (1468-9)

Dawe (2001) 7 argues that i1qi is "much too vigorous for the context", and that when it does not simply mean "come" or "go", it is followed by another, different imperative. But the intensity of Oedipus' request arises from (i) the strength of his desire to hold his children (see above under ma/lista)[13] and (ii) his reversal of status, which means that he must now beg Creon for what before would have been an automatic privilege. Dawe's second claim is refuted by *Phil.* 733 a0ll' i1q', w} te/knon and 749-50 a0pa/mhson w(j ta/xista: mh\ fei/sh| bi/ou. | i1q', w} pai=[14]. But even without the counterexamples, the point would not be significant. Within the narrower limits of an outburst among trimeters, Sophocles may well have chosen to confine himself to a pair of imperatives (as in the anapaests at *Tr.* 1085-6; contrast the fuller style of e.g. *OR* 46-7 i1q', w} brotw~n a1rist', a0no/rqwson po/lin: | i1q', eu0labh/qhq').

Oi. xersi/ ta2n qigw_n

dokoi=m' e1xein sfaj, w3sper h9ni/k' e1blepon. (1469-70)

Dawe (2001) 7 argues that e1xein is "very weak". But the common use of e1xw in scenes of recognition and reunion (cf. *El.* 1226 e1xw se xersi/n; with my note) suggests that an ancient Greek would not have shared this view.

[13] Cf. Budelmann (2006) 58: "the strong imperative i1q 0 in 1468 is appropriately impatient for the anxious Oedipus, and may be understood either in connection with the preceding e1ason or as an absolute request to 'go' and fetch the daughters."

[14] These passages are cited by Davies (1991) 4. He rightly characterises the arguments against their relevance here by Eicken-Iselin (1942, 276 n. 1) as "hair-splitting".

Oi. a0ll' eu0tuxoi/hj, kai/ se th=sde th=j o9dou=

dai/mwn a1meinon h2 'me\ frourh/saj tu/xoi. (1478-9)

Dawe objects to the causal genitive in 1478, and suggests that it may have been based on a misinterpretation of *OC* 1505-6 kai/ soi qew~n | tu/xhn tij e0sqlh\n th=sd' e1qhke th=j o9dou= ("some god has ordained for you the good fortune of this coming": cf. Jebb). But at (2001) 8 he himself notes the parallel for the construction, *OR* 47-8 w(j se\ nu=n me\n h3de gh= | swth=ra klh|/zei th=j pa/roj proqumi/aj. He proposes to remove that example by adding < 0k> after klh|/zei, but we might rather think that the two examples support each other. Even supposing that both cases are in need of textual surgery, why is emendation the proposed remedy in one case, but excision in the other?

Dawe also objects to the sense "sending", "conducting" (i.e. of the children) for o9do/j, which appears to be the meaning preferred by the Byzantine scholia (e3neka: h[j e1pemyaj dhlono/ti ta\j ko/raj[15]): cf. Campbell's translation ("in requital for thus bringing them"). But in the passage from *OC* above o9do/j means "coming": that is, a road completed. We may suppose that such a sense is also present here[16].

[15] In Longo (1971) 89; not in Papageorgius (1888).

[16] Professor Collard persuades me that this sense is possible. Thus Mazon, "pour te payer de cette venue". Jebb's "for guerdon of this errand" fudges the issue. Lloyd-Jones translates "may a god guide you on this path better than I was guided" (similarly March (1987) 149 n. 169), which misconstrues the genitive and gives impossible sense: what is this path which Oedipus and Creon share, and what has it to do with the arrival of his children?

Oi. w} te/kna, pou= pot' e0ste/; deu=r' i1t', e1lqete

w(j ta\j a0delfa\j ta/sde ta\j e0ma\j xe/raj,

ai4 tou= futourgou= patro\j u9mi\n w{d' o9ra=n

ta\ pro/sqe lampra\ prou0ce/nhsan o1mmata:

o4j u9mi/n, w} te/kn', ou1q' o9rw~n ou1q' i9storw~n

path\r e0fa/nqhn e1nqen au0to\j h0ro/qhn. (1480-5)

Dawe objects that line 1481 is "revolting". Budelmann (2006) 58 counters by saying that the reference to "the hands of a brother" constitutes "an expression of anguish over what he has done"; he compares *OC* 330, where Oedipus addresses Ismene w} spe/rm' o3maimon, which he calls "an only slightly less gruesome term". In any case, Dawe's objection is too subjective to have weight.

On 1481 Dawe also remarks that "w(j = 'to' can only be justified by saying that 'my hands' is equivalent to 'me'"[17]. If this is a problem, we can turn to the *supra lineam* variant ei0j in K (Laurentianus 31.10: see Finglass 2008, 445). Dawe refers to *Tr.* 366, where Lloyd-Jones and Wilson print e0j for transmitted w(j[18]. Perhaps both passages need emendation; perhaps they support each other as they are. Whichever view we take, it is inconsistent to delete one and not the other.

Correctly identifying that in 1482-3 "the original idea is of a pro/cenoj who uses his good offices to achieve a particular result", Dawe objects to the resulting sense, which

[17] Davies (1991) 5 accepts such a justification: "since xe/rej here is *pars pro toto*, with 'my hands' equivalent to 'me', the extension is perfectly legitimate."

[18] The emendation was proposed by Markland on Eur. *Suppl.* 312 (p. 136). Lloyd-Jones and Wilson incorrectly attribute it to Brunck.

he renders "Hands whose good offices have brought it about that my formerly bright eyes see like this." But as Dawe notes, Sophocles does use this verb in a metaphorical sense elsewhere (*Tr.* 726 e0lpi/j, h3tij kai\ qra/soj ti procenei=), although he does not regard this as evidence that our passage is genuine. Jebb cites two parallels (Xen. *An.* 6.5.14 and Plut. *Alex.* 22.1) where the verb introduces a negative idea, as above. Dawe goes on to object that "the fact that the eyes were formerly bright does not prevent the poet from continuing with ou1q 0 o9rw~n when describing Oedipus's marriage with Jocasta." But the thematic continuity is more apt than Dawe allows. Oedipus ruefully reflects that when he could see, he failed to realise the truth about his marriage; now he has the truth, but has lost his sight. This fits with the link between vision and knowledge which pervades the drama. Dawe also finds the infinitive o9ra=n problematic: but the final-consecutive sense appears inoffensive to me.

In the commentary Dawe further adds that "the interpolator ... know[s] the Sophoclean mannerism of scanning the second syllable of u9mi/n as short." But we do not expect an interpolator to be quite such a connoisseur of the work which he imitates, especially when (as Dawe elsewhere assumes) he is an incompetent writer. The short iota in 1482 and 1484 is strong testimony that these lines are genuine. As for the repetition of the form over a short space (to which Dawe also appears to object in the remainder of his note, although this is not quite clear), it is also found twice in *OR* 39-42 and *El.* 1328-32, yet Dawe does not advocate the deletion of either of these passages.

In 1485, Dawe (2006) prints Herwerden's conjecture a0roth/r, complaining that the transmitted path/r is "flat and obvious". But given that he believes that this whole passage is by an interpolator, this objection only has weight if Dawe can show that the

interpolator avoids flat and obvious language. This he does not attempt. Indeed, elsewhere he regards incompetence as the one sure sign of the interpolator's work. If one was determined to emend the work of such a hack writer, a better approach might be to find passages which are competently expressed, and introduce linguistic errors so as to put them on a level with the rest of his output.

Oi. kai\ sfw_ dakru/w, prosble/pein ga\r ou0 sqe/nw,
noou/menoj ta\ pikra\ tou= loipou= bi/ou,
oi[on biw~nai sfw_ pro\j a0nqrw&pwn xrew&n. (1486-8)

For Dawe (2001) 9, prosble/pein ga\r ou0 sqe/nw either goes with what precedes it, in which case it is "an utterly tasteless labouring of the obvious", or else anticipates noou/menoj, which gives an obscure construction. In his commentary he acquiesces in the latter solution, but the former is more likely: as previous commentators have noted, the eyes which cannot see the children can at least weep for them. The unique use of the middle noou/menoj, which offended Dawe in 2001, is rightly not taken to be a problem in his commentary. What he calls the "extraordinary grammar of biw~nai pro/j" can be paralleled by *Tr.* 934-5 o1y' e0kdidaxqei\j tw~n kat' oi]kon ou3neka | a1kousa pro\j tou= qhro\j e1rceien ta/de. Dawe writes that Heimreich's a9lou=sa removes that parallel by changing a single letter: but this would remove a1kousa, a key word in this passage. (Jernstedt's deletion of the line, together with 932-4, has nothing to recommend it.) Dawe then makes much of the fact that biw~nai only occurs in tragedy at Eur. *Alc.* 784 and Tr.

Adesp. fr. 566a Kannicht–Snell: so do we delete all words which occur in tragedy only three times?

Oi. poi/aj ga\r a0stw~n h3cet' ei0j o9mili/aj,
poi/aj d' e0orta/j, e1nqen ou0 keklaume/nai
pro\j oi]kon i3cesq' a0nti\ th=j qewri/aj;
a0ll' h9ni/k' a2n dh\ pro\j ga/mwn h3kht' a0kma/j,
ti/j ou[toj e1stai, ti/j pararri/yei, te/kna,
toiau=t' o0nei/dh lamba/nwn ... (1489-94)

Dawe objects that a0nti\ th=j qewri/aj is unnecessary, and translates "What festivals will you go to from which you will not come home in tears instead of seeing the festival!" Lloyd-Jones (1997) renders "from which you will not return in tears instead of taking pleasure in the show", but this translates not the text, but the Byzantine scholium a0nti\ th=j a0po\ th=j qewri/aj te/ryewj[19]. Rather, as Jebb reminds us, qewri/a can denote both a spectacle and the act of watching such a spectacle. There is thus no superfluity.

Dawe also objects that a0lla/ in 1492 involves a usage which Denniston (1954) 241 can only parallel from prose. This idiom in question is a0lla\ ... dh/ in a progressive sense, meaning "further", "again", or "moreover" (Lloyd-Jones's "but" is wrong). But there are several examples of progressive a0lla\ ... me\n dh/ in Sophocles (Denniston 394-5), as well as some of progressive a0lla/ in poetry (*ibid.* 21-2). If Dawe is right, the

[19] In Longo (1971) 89; not in Papageorgius (1888).

addition of me/n makes all the difference. But it is not apparent why it should, especially as Sophocles uses a0lla\ ... dh/ in a closely related sense, to move on to a new point after a rejected suggestion, as at *OR* 1021 a0ll' a0nti\ tou= dh\ pai=da/ m' w)noma/zeto; ("Well, then, why ...": Denniston 241). Moreover, it is not clear that Denniston and Dawe are right to take dh/ in our passage closely with a0lla/. It seems rather to emphasise the h9ni/ka clause, stressing the climactic moment when the daughters' social disabilities will become most apparent. a0lla/ and dh/ often retain independent functions: to cite a line at random, cf. *Aj.* 1271 a0ll' oi1xetai dh\ pa/nta tau=t' e0rrimme/na.

Oi. ka|}ta ti/j gamei=;

ou0k e1stin ou0dei/j, w} te/kn', a0lla\ dhladh\

xe/rsouj fqarh=nai ka0ga/mouj u9ma=j xrew&n. (1500-2)

Dawe complains that the theme of marriage is introduced as if new, even though it has already appeared at 1492-5. This misunderstands the rhetoric. The section 1486-1502 is a single unit, in which Oedipus explores the future consequences of his disgrace for his daughters[20]. At 1496-9 he lists the o0nei/dh which will accrue to the girls, and, as a consequence, to any prospective husband of theirs. Then he asks ka|}ta ti/j gamei=;

[20] Pearson (followed by Lloyd-Jones and Wilson) rightly paragraphs this as a single section. Dawe disrupts the continuity in his commentaries and Teubner editions by beginning a new paragraph at 1496, as well as by failing to mark a new paragraph at 1486.

"And consequently[21] who will marry you?" – a question provoked by the stark account of the family's troubles, but which also picks up the theme with which the section began. For the whole passage is patterned by ring composition: "Who will marry you?" is followed by toiau=t' o0nei/dh (1494), followed by the list of insults, capped in turn by toiau=t' o0neidiei=sqe (1500), before we come full circle with "And consequently who will marry you?"

Dawe also finds dhladh/ "a word with dubious connections". Its three other occurrences in tragedy are *Andr.* 856 (where Kovacs, but not Diggle, adopts Seidler's deletion, first proposed by Triclinius), *Or.* 789 (where Dawe says it is a colloquialism), and *IA* 1366 (from a passage "all of which is thought to be spurious", according to Dawe: but which Diggle regards as "(versus) fortasse Euripidei", his highest accolade of authenticity (see (1994) 358), and which Kovacs also retains). It is hard to see what case has been established against the word.

Oi. w} pai= Menoike/wj, a0ll' e0pei\ mo/noj path\r
tau/tain le/leiyai, nw_ ga/r, w4 'futeu/samen,
o0lw&lamen du/' o1nte, mh/ sfe †pari/dh|j†[22]

[21] For ka|0ta "as a consequence" cf. *Ant.* 1019 ("and consequently" *recte* Griffith, "and" *male* Lloyd-Jones), Eur. *Andr.* 391, 600. Denniston (1954) 311 does not distinguish between this sense and the other "And despite this ...", as at *Phil.* 1283, Eur. *Alc.* 701, 831, *Ion* 297 (possibly), 1408.

[22] On the problem of pari/dh|j (which Dawe 2006 rightly obelises) see Housman *ap.* Diggle (2007) 165-8, who shows that the conjecture perii/dh|j (adopted by Dawe in his Teubner editions) is most unlikely. An annotated edition in the Leiden University Library shows that this emendation, previously attributed to Dawes (1745, 268), must be reattributed to Scaliger: see Finglass (2009) 190.

ptwxa\j a0na/ndrouj e0ggenei=j a0lwme/naj,

mhd' e0cisw&sh|j ta/sde toi=j e0moi=j kakoi=j. (1503-7)

Dawe complains that du/' o1nte is perfunctory, in contrast to the use of the phrase in other passages such as *Tr.* 539, Eur. *Ion* 518, *IA* 887, and Pl. *Gorg.* 481d. Even if true, this tells us nothing about authenticity: we do not expect a given phrase always to show the same degree of significance and literary merit (supposing that there were a reliable measure of such things) in all its occurrences in classical literature. But Dawe's objection fails even on its own terms. At *Tr.* 539-40 (Deianira on herself and Iole) kai\ nu=n du/' ou]sai mi/mnomen mia=j u9po\ | xlai/nhj u9pagka/lisma there is an effective juxtaposition between the pair, Deianira and Iole (du/' ou]sai) and the single coverlet, where they must wait as a single object of embrace for Heracles (cf. Long (1968) 119). But in our passage too there is a contrast between the pair of parents who are now destroyed, and Creon who *alone* (mo/noj 1503) must now take care for the children. The potential objection that the contrast is not as moving as in the *Trachiniae* passage applies an inappropriately narrow standard of literary merit to a textual question.

Dawe also believes that Oedipus' request "And do not put these girls on the same level as my own misfortunes" must have been written by someone who knew the *Oedipus Coloneus*. But the idea that the destruction of parents can involve children in disaster is familiar in literature from the *Iliad* on. Note especially 22.477-514, where Andromache's speech at the death of Hector is dominated by considerations of how it will affect their son Astyanax (cf. e.g. 490 h]mar d 0 o0rfaniko\n panafh/lika pai=da ti/qhsi). If Sophocles has never written the later *Oedipus* play, we would not be wondering what this line could refer to.

Oi. nu=n de\ tou=t' eu1xesqe/ moi,

ou[kairo\j e0a|~ zh=n, tou= bi/ou de\ lw|&onoj

u9ma=j kurh=sai tou= futeu/santoj patro/j. (1512-14)

Dawe in his commentary writes of futeu/santoj "the word carries no special emphasis here, but 'the father that begot you' did so in very unusual circumstances, and the interpolator does not shrink from touching the exposed nerve." But as with e.g. 1481, he desiderates a delicacy and euphemism of language which Sophocles does not employ in the conclusion to his tragedy. Dawe's point would need to be taken seriously if and only if he could show that such delicacy was characteristic of Sophocles' surviving work apart from this scene. I for one would not feel comfortable attempting to demonstrate such a proposition.

The final section (1515-30) attracts two general objections from Dawe. The first is that Oedipus' appeal in 1503-14 is all ignored by Creon. This is not problematic. In a technique identified by Mastronarde (1979, 82) as the "self-willed maintenance of one's own topic", Creon insists on Oedipus' going in and does not allow further delay. The second is that the metre of this section, trochaic tetrameters, is not found in extant tragedy from 458 to 415 B.C. (In his commentary he expands this to 472-415, since by then he had deleted the end of *Agamemnon*: see Dawe (2004) 117-25.) But it is found in

Philoctetes (409 B.C.) towards the end of the play (1402-8); would anyone deny that Sophocles could have used it before then?[23]

Oi. oi]sq' e0f' oi[j ou]n ei]mi; Kr. le/ceij, kai\ to/t' ei1somai kluw&n.

Oi. gh=j m' o3pwj pe/myeij a1poikon. Kr. tou= qeou= m' ai0tei=j do/sin.

Oi. a0lla\ qeoi=j g' e1xqistoj h3kw. Kr. toigarou=n teu/ch| ta/xa. (1517-19)

Dawe complains that the theme of Oedipus' departure from Thebes is introduced as if it were something new. The recapitulation of this central theme is hardly surprising, however, and has the dramatic function of demonstrating Oedipus' persistence and unwillingness to yield to his new condition.

In his commentary, Dawe says that Creon's reply at 1517 is "abject line-filling"[24], but cf. *El.* 318 ei0de/nai qe/lw and Aesch. *Cho.* 175 poi/aij e0qei/raij; tou=to ga\r maqei=n qe/lw, where Garvie cites further parallels. Davies (1991) 6 plausibly associates the response with Creon's cautious character.

Dawe writes of 1519 that "if Creon believes his own logic he should accept this as a reason for not consulting the god a superfluous second time." But the sense of Creon's statement is "If, as you say, the gods do hate you, then indeed you will soon get what you are looking for" (cf. Jebb, supported by Davies (1982) 270 n. 7). Moreover, Creon's

[23] The metrical similarity with *Agamemnon* may be more than fortuitous, as Davies (1991) 6 points out: "in Aeschylus' play, [the trochaic tetrameters] convey the clash of personality and standpoint between Aegisthus and the chorus, a clash unresolvable except by the brute fact of Aegisthus' assumption of power. The position between Creon and Oedipus is not very different."

[24] Dawe (2001) 10 says that this judgment (first found in his 1982 commentary) is "possibly too harsh", but he evidently changed his mind back again in his 2006 commentary.

decision to consult the oracle a second time fits the personality we encountered before. As Davies says (1982, 276), "the accession to the throne has not rid him of the circumscribed and limiting caution which characterised his earlier acts".

Kr. pa/nta mh\ bou/lou kratei=n:

kai\ ga\r a9kra/thsaj ou1 soi tw|~ bi/w| cune/speto. (1522-3)

In his commentary Dawe complains that Creon's rejoinder is "an exaggerated reaction to a request made by a pitiful blind suppliant", and that he "uses mh\ bou/lou like the latin *noli*, to introduce a prohibition, something which Wackernagel, [1926-8, ii. 261], denies ever occurs with this verb." He is wrong on both counts. Creon is not telling Oedipus "do not control everything", which would be an absurd prohibition in the context. Rather, he tells him "Do not desire to be master in everything" – in other words, he warns Oedipus that he must trim his desires in accordance with his new status. mh\ bou/lou thus means what it ought to mean, and is not equivalent to *noli*[25].

To consider Dawe's former objection, Creon's reply is indeed exaggerated, given Oedipus' request: but for this to count as a sign of inauthenticity, Dawe would have to show that no disagreement in classical Greek literature is ever marked by exaggeration.

[25] As for the reference to Wackernagel, Dawe appears to misread the Swiss. In the passage he cites, Wackernagel discusses how bou/lomai is not found with a negative before Anacreon, but says nothing about whether it can introduce a prohibition. But even if Dawe has given a false reference and Wackernagel does make such a claim elsewhere, it would not be relevant to our passage, for the reason set out above.

This he wisely does not attempt. One thinks of (e.g.) Eur. *Alc.* 63, where Thanatos tells Apollo ou0k a2n du/naio pa/nt 0 e1xein a4 mh/ se dei=, even though Apollo has not literally attempted to acquire *everything* that he ought not; or of Agamemnon's repetition of pa/nta in his quarrel with Achilles (Hom. *Il.* 1.287-9). Here Oedipus is continuing to make requests of Creon, and while Creon has granted some of them, his patience is now at an end, and he expresses himself more forcibly. As Davies (1982, 275) says of the lines, "That reminder of the obvious would be unbearably harsh and tasteless – and as such out of keeping with Creon's character – had not the former will to dominate soon revived in Oedipus' breast."[26] They also make an effective end to the scene, emphasising how "Oedipus, formerly the king, now cannot even control his own destiny: he has to be in Creon's hands" (C. W. Macleod *ap.* Taplin (1978) 46); cf. Davies's description of them as "a painful reminder of his utter physical helplessness" (1982, 270).

Dawe also complains that the sense of 1523, "the exercises of your power did not accompany your life", is inept, and was modelled on *OC* 839 mh\ 'pi/tass' a4 mh\ kratei=j (also spoken by Creon to Oedipus). It is easier to suppose that the latter passage provides a Sophoclean parallel for the phrase, whose ineptness arises rather from Dawe's translation than from the Greek itself. Better is Jebb's 'the mastery which thou didst win hath not followed thee through life'; Lloyd-Jones prefers 'Power to control did not accompany you through all your life', but a9kra/thsaj requires a more specific referent.

[26] Oedipus' continued desire for mastery in this scene was noted by Boivin (of whom more below) "Revenons à Oedipe. Il perd enfin patience, il commence à parler en maître, et prononce lui-même sa condamnation. Ensuite il demande instamment qu'on fasse venir ses enfans" (1729a, 382 = 1729b, 29).

Dawe also objects to a number of repetitions across the passage (2001, 11 and 2006, on 1522-3). This objection would only have merit if he could show that a similar amount of repetition could not be found in any passage of Sophocles which we know to be genuine. As he does not attempt to do this, I leave it unanswered. Dawe (2001) 11 further complains about "certain expressions which, while not abuses of language, may displease the fastidious", citing 1469 w} gonh|~ gennai=e, 1474 ta\ fi/ltat' e0kgo/noin e0moi=n. But in his commentary, he admits that the former is "probably less pleonastic than we feel it to be", and compares Men. *Theoph.* fr. 1.14-15 (p. 147 Sandbach) eu0genh\j sfo/dra | gennai=oj; of the latter he simply writes "constituent genitive, the dear things which are my children." I therefore conclude that he has withdrawn his objections to these phrases.

Having deleted the ending of the play, in which Oedipus' daughters appear, Dawe also expresses doubts about the references to them earlier in the play, in his notes on 261, 424-5, 1250, and 1375-7 (see the introduction to his commentary, p. viii). But his reasoning in each case is flimsy, to say the least: and to avoid lengthening an already long article I do not propose to discuss these passages here.

There are scholars who would oppose almost any deletion of lines found in a mediaeval manuscript: I am not one of them. But in the light of the discussion above I am forced to conclude that the linguistic problems of the passage alleged by Dawe are illusory. This does not prove that the passage is genuine, any more than Barrett (2007) proved that the end of the *Septem* was genuine by disposing of the linguistic objections

alleged by Dawe (1978). But in that case there were many good reasons to accept the deletion quite apart from those set out by Dawe. This is not so with the end of *Oedipus Rex*. The onus is on would-be deleters to make a case, and insofar as I can establish no good case exists.

Appendix: who first deleted the ending of the play?

Dawe (2001) 3 with n. 4 claims that suspicions about the passage beginning at 1424 were first voiced by Schenkl (*ap*. Bonitz 1857, 195) and Graffunder (1885). Modern editors also attribute the deletion of 1524-30 to Ritter (1861), with Teuffel (1874) going further and deleting 1515-30. It turns out, however, that all these scholars had been long

anticipated. The deletion of the ending is not owed (as we might have guessed) to a scholar writing during the heyday of German classical philology, but to a Frenchman, appointed to a chair during the reign of Louis XIV. This is remarkable, since we do not associate this period in France with serious critical scholarship on Greek dramatic texts. Moreover, the deletion now becomes the earliest in Sophocles known to me, anticipating the work of figures such as Bentley, Wesseling, and Valckenaer later in the century.

Jean Boivin de Villeneuve (1663-1726) was Professor of Greek at the Collège de France from 1706, and Member of the Académie Française from 1721. On 5th April 1718 he delivered a lecture on *Oedipus Rex*, which was printed after his death in the Memoirs of the Royal Academy of Inscriptions and as an introduction to his translation of the play[27]. In it, he raised various objections to the end of the play, beginning with the entrance of Creon at 1422. They concern content rather than language[28]. His chief complaint is that Creon is excessively harsh in his sentiments towards Oedipus, and that this is inconsistent with the tenor of his opening words at 1422-3[29]. He also objects to

[27] 1729a and 1729b respectively. The date of the lecture is taken from 1729a, 372. I henceforth cite Boivin's piece in the form 'X = Y', where X is the page reference to 1729a, Y to 1729b.

[28] As David Butterfield reminds me, the content of the final part of the play (from after Oedipus' discovery of the truth) was also criticised in the following year by Voltaire (1719, 103-5), although he was attempting to justify the much briefer conclusion of his own handling of the story, not to impugn the authenticity of the Greek text.

[29] "On croit qu'il va continuer sur le même ton; nullement" (382 = 27, on 1422-3). "Cela est bien dur, sur-tout dans la bouche d'un homme, dont on vient de vanter la clémence et la générosité" (382 = 28, on 1438-9). "Il n'y a rien de plus insultant que cette réponse, rien qui démente davantage l'idée qu'on s'étoit faite de la bonté de Créon" (382 = 29, on 1445). "Ce compliment, de quelque maniére qu'on le tourne, quelque adoucissement qu'y puisse apporter le Traducteur le plus habile et le plus délié, est certainement bien dur et

Creon's proposal to consult the oracle again[30], and to Oedipus' laments over his daughters[31].

Although Boivin consequently suggests that the ending may be spurious, he acknowledges that there is room for doubt[32]. This does not apply to the final seven lines (1524-30), however, which he is certain are interpolated[33]. He correctly identifies that 1524-7 have been clumsily adapted from Euripides' *Phoenissae* (1753-63) and 1528-30 from his *Andromache* (100-2), and adumbrates the linguistic problems of 1526[34]. As for the motive behind the interpolation, he does not raise the question of deliberate alteration in order to fit the play to *Oedipus Coloneus*. Rather, he suggests that the final section of the common ancestor of all our manuscripts was damaged, after which an ending was reconstructed by someone with a knowledge of Sophoclean style, but a lack of literary

---

bien peu gracieux, sur-tout de la part d'un homme bon, humain, et compâtissant" (383 = 31, 1522-3). Since he specifies that Creon's subsequent speeches are inconsistent with 1422-3, the implication is that he believes that 1422-3 are genuine – in other words, that his suspicions begin in exactly the same place as did Dawe's, nearly three hundred years later.

[30] "Pourquoi consulter l'Oracle, qui a déjà prononcé sur ce qu'on veut savoir?" (382 = 29, on 1438-9)

[31] "Il semble que ce n'étoit pas ici le lieu d'entrer dans un si grand détail" (383 = 30); cf. 29-30, asking why Creon lets Oedipus stay for so long given his opening remarks on the urgent need to bring him indoors.

[32] "Il y auroit de la témérité à assûrer hardiment, que les deux scénes critiquées ne sont pas de Sophocle; on l'y reconnoît même à quelques traits" (383 = 32).

[33] This passage "très-certainement n'est pas de Sophocle" (384 = 33) ... "tout cet épilogue n'est qu'une moralité fade, usée et triviale, un lieu commun, qui convient indifféremment à la plupart des sujets tragiques" (384 = 34).

[34] The line "est si mal construit, qu'on n'y peut faire un sens raisonnable, qu'en donnant la torture aux mots pour en redresser la construction" (384 = 34).

sense[35]. He speaks in general terms of linguistic difficulties in the passage, but again without giving specifics[36].

Two generations later Boivin's work was known to Heath, who argues at length against the proposed deletion[37]. In his edition of 1809, Erfurdt briefly deprecates the idea that there is a break after 1423[38], which could indicate knowledge of Boivin[39]; while Matthiae knows of his deletion in 1832[40]. But in general scholars appear to be unaware of Boivin's arguments: even his compatriot Brunck, who published his fundamental and

[35] "Un homme versé dans la lecture de Sophocle, mais un homme de mauvais goût, aura voulu remplir les lacunes, et substituer ses pensées et ses expressions à celles d'un si grand maître" (383-4 = 32-3).

[36] "De là viennent tant de différentes, et tant de mauvaises leçons; tant de phrases équivoques, obscures" (384 = 33).

[37] Heath (1762) 38: "Haec omnia contra verisimilitudinem et decori rationem peccare, atque ideo Sophocle plane indigna esse, censet Boivinus Commentar. Acad. Gallic. Inscript. vol. VIII. p. 602-606 [*sic*]. Eo igitur iudice, si non omnino spuria pronuncianda sint, at saltem a recentiore quodam partem maximam interpolata existimari debent." He puts forward his objections to Boivin's case in subsequent notes. He does accept that the closing trochaic tetrameters are problematic (p. 41), deleting 1524-5 and positing a lacuna before 1526.

[38] "Nexum cum sequentibus fuisse miror qui non intelligeret. Quod enim exspectatur: sed ut introire te iuberem, id ipsum ille, si attendere voluisset, fortius expressum vidisset" (from his note on his 1409 = our 1423). The singular "intelligeret" suggests that he had a particular target in mind, perhaps Boivin.

[39] Since Heath mentions Boivin's case in his note on 1422 (his 1435), and never mentions a gap between 1423 and 1424, Erfurdt appears not to have derived his knowledge of Boivin (if it is that) from him. He may have known his work directly, or through a reference in another source unknown to me.

[40] Matthiae (1832) 30: "Primum Boivinus quidam, Gallus, omnium celerrime sese expediens totum, dico totum hunc locum spurium esse iudicat neque a Sophocle profectum" (referring to 1524-30). I owe this reference to David Butterfield.

influential edition of Sophocles in 1786. This is despite the discussion of his deletion found in Heath's book, a work which Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990, 2) hail as one of the two most notable contributions to the text of Sophocles in the 18th century, and which is accessible both in libraries and online[41]. Subsequent editors appear to have relied, mainly or wholly, on Brunck's citations of Heath rather than checking the book at first hand. As a result, they have wrongly attributed several conjectures to later scholars which are properly owed to Heath, and have missed the vital clues which Heath can provide regarding earlier scholarship. One is reminded of the recent comment from a more diligent editor of Greek dramatic texts: "Sophoclean scholars, it seems, live in a private world of their own, blissfully unaware of what their predecessors or contemporaries have been up to."[42]

It is still not yet time to turn to Schenkl *et al.* In or before 1840 F. C. W. Jacobs (1764-1847) deleted 1526[43]. Then in a dissertation published in 1851 which advocates several deletions throughout the play, L. van Deventer ejected 1515-23 on the ground that 1517-20 repeat content from earlier in the scene[44]. As for the closing tag, van Deventer's nerve fails him (for once), and he declares only part of 1528-9 (from o1nt 0 to h9me/ran inclusive) to be spurious (adopting Bothe's change of e0piskpou=nta to –aj), while also

[41] In *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*: http://gale.cengage.com/EighteenthCentury/about.htm.

[42] Austin 2006, 105.

[43] This is reported by Wunder 1840 in his apparatus. Jacobs was one of the editors of the Bibliotheca Graeca series in which Wunder's edition appeared, so this may reflect a personal communication to Wunder.

[44] The lines "ea tantum complectuntur, quae iam vs. 1432-1454 pluribus et aliquanto melioribus dicta sunt, quaeque nunc recantata taedium et fastidium pariant necesse est." (1851, 39-40)

adopting the deletion of 1526 by Jacobs. As for 1424-1514, he retains it all – apart from, that is, 1451-8, or the one passage in this section which Dawe accepts as authentic (pp. 36-9). His suspicions (e.g. the conative imperfect in 1454) do not need to be taken seriously.

Up to now we have been dealing with deletions alleged on various grounds, but have not encountered the idea that the end of *Oedipus Rex* was altered in order to fit the later play *Oedipus Coloneus*. The earliest reference to this which I have found is in Schneidewin (1853) 206, at the end of his extensive discussion of the various forms of the Oedipus myth in literature[45]. He posits a rewriting by Sophocles himself, however, rather than by someone else.

In the *Anhang* to his first revision of Schneidewin's edition of the play (published in 1856), Nauck suspected that 1424-31 should be moved to between 1415 and 1416. In an article published in the following year he states that this is now his firm opinion, arguing that the lines are too harsh for Creon, and that the reference to komi/zontej is obscure (1857, 634-7). He also emends the end of 1423 to tw~n pepragme/nwn, on the ground that it avoids an unseasonable allusion[46]. The transposition is not attractive: the

[45] "Sieht man endlich auf den Ausgang des römischen Stückes [i.e. Seneca's *Oedipus*], so wird dieser die Frage entschuldigen, ob nicht Sophokles' Ödipus in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt ähnlich geendet haben, unsre Bearbeitung aber wenigstens dem letzten Theil nach, vom Dichter später umgemodelt sein sollte, um zu dem Ödipus auf Kolonos in ein engeres Verhältniss zu treten. Wir legen kein Gewicht auf diese Muthmassung, wollten sie aber nicht unterdrücken." Schneidewin's essay is known to March (1987, 148 n. 60) and Davies (1991, 14), but is not cited in more recent work.

[46] "Der ausdruck ta\ pa/roj kaka/ muss den Oedipus verletzen, indem er ihn an seine schuld erinnert: gerade dies aber will Kreon meiden" (1857, 636).

last place Oedipus wants to go is e0j oi]kon, and Nauck's attempts to evade this point do not convince. But it nevertheless gives us a second scholar before Schenkl who saw a problem in the transition from 1423 to 1424.

Only now do we reach Schenkl, with all the deletions, and many of the arguments used to support them, having already been put forward. Schenkl argues that some lines dropped out after 1423, on the grounds that the severity of Creon's words from 1424 onwards does not fit his opening two lines, and that he should say something about his new adminstrative responsibilities. He does not delete the following lines, however[47].

As we have already seen, Ritter (1861, 424-8) deleted 1524-30 (as he did the tailpieces of all the seven surviving plays), while Teuffel (1874) deleted all of 1515-30. Graffunder (1885) keeps 1524-30 (p. 405), but almost nothing else: inconsistency of plot (pp. 400-1, regarding Oedipus' exile) and characterisation (p. 400, Creon's), as well as the absence of a proper concern for constitutional proprieties (pp. 401-2, 405), all encourage him to remove much of the closing scene.

We have now reached the two scholars credited by Dawe with the earliest suspicions about the closing scene, and have found that the question had interested scholars for many years before they wrote. There is no need to continue giving an account of scholarly opinion down to the present day. In more recent times scholars have

[47] "... es möchten nach 1423 ein paar Verse ausgefallen sein, die, den negativen Versicherungen ou1q 0 w(j gelasth\j ktl. gegenüber, positiv aussagten, dass Kreon das in der gegenwärtigen Lage zum Heile des Staates erforderliche thun werde, und so den Übergang zu der Aufforderung bahnten, die zunächst erfüllt werden müsste. Der gleiche Versanfang a0ll 0 könnte die Auslassung veranlasst haben" (ap. Bonitz (1857) 195).

continued to examine the authenticity of 1424-1514[48], 1515-23[49], and of 1524-30[50]. Whatever contribution this article may have made to that debate, I hope at least that scholars will from now on attribute these deletions to their proper owners, and that future apparatuses will read "1424-1530 del. Boivin (1515-23 van Deventer)".

---

[48] See n. 9 above.

[49] This deletion is approved by Hester (1984) 23 and Müller (1996) 219-20 = (1999) 243. The former believes that "an explicit consent by Creon to the exile has been removed from somewhere after 1441", and bits of this were reused in the interpolated passage 1515-30. For the latter, 1517-19 are a weak repetition of 1432-45, while Creon's character now shows an unacceptable change: previously "der untragische, aber honorige Biedermann", he now shows signs of becoming "der Kreon des *Ödipus auf Kolonos* auf dem Weg zur Machtübernahme".

[50] The best modern treatment of this question is by Dawe (1973-8, i. 266-73), who condemns the lines on the basis of a series of serious linguistic problems, and who then attempts to show how they were constructed out of various passages of Euripides and pseudo-Euripides. The defence of the lines offered by Arkins (1988) makes no attempt to engage with the linguistic problems, and can be disregarded. Olson (1989) argues that while 1526-30 may be spurious, 1524-5 are genuine. (Contrast Heath who, as noted above (n. 37), regarded 1524-5 as the only *spurious* lines in the tailpiece.) His attack on Dawe's account of the relationship between 1524-30 and the Euripidean passages scores some hits. But the linguistic difficulties (the heart of Dawe's case) remain, and Olson's notion that we can separate 1524-5 from the rest is unlikely to convince: the lines stand or fall together. Lloyd-Jones and Wilson retain the lines in the Oxford Classical Text, adding (1990, 114) "A case can be made against them, but it cannot be regarded as established." Tellingly, however, they are forced to adopt no fewer than four emendations (not three, as they claim in *Sophoclea*) in three lines in order to achieve something that with a great deal of goodwill might possibly approximate to sense. So many problems, with no convincing emendations to hand, in so small a space strongly suggests interpolation rather than corruption – and that is even without considering the external evidence.

Department of Classics

University of Nottingham

University Park

N o t t i n g h a m, NG7 2RD

United Kingdom

Bibliography

B. Arkins, The final lines of Sophocles, *King Oedipus* (1524-30), CQ N.S. 38, 1988, 555-8.

C. F. L. Austin, The girl who said "No" (Sophocles' *Antigone*), Eikasmos 17, 2006, 103-15.

W. S. Barrett (ed., comm.) Euripides. Hippolytos, Oxford 1964.

W. S. Barrett, *Seven against Thebes*: the final scene, in id. Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism, assembled and edited by M. L. West, Oxford 2007, 322-50.

J. Boivin de Villeneuve, Discours sur la tragédie de Sophocle, intitulée Oi0di/pouj Tu/rannoj. Oedipe Roy, Memoires de litterature tirez des registres de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Depuis l'année M.DCCXVIII. jusques & compris l'année M.DCCXXV. Tome sixième, Paris 1729, 372-84. [1729a]

J. Boivin de Villeneuve, Préface de l'Oedipe de Sophocles, in id. (transl.), Oedipe, tragédie de Sophocle, et les Oiseaux, comédie d'Aristophane, Paris 1729, 3-35. [1729b]

H. Bonitz, review of Schneidewin 1856, Zeitschrift für die österreichischen gymnasien 8, 1857, 193-205.

R. F. P. Brunck (ed.), Sophoclis quae supersunt omnia, Strasbourg 1786.

F. Budelmann, The mediated ending of Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus, MD 57, 2006, 43-61. [Appeared 2007]

A. Dain (ed.) and P. Mazon (transl.), Sophocle Tome II. Ajax – Oedipe Roi – Électre, Paris 1958.

M. Davies, The end of Sophocles' O.T., Hermes 110, 1982, 268-77.

M. Davies, The end of Sophocles' *O.T.* revisited, Prometheus 17, 1991, 1-18.

M. Davies (comm.), Sophocles. Trachiniae, Oxford 1991.

R. D. Dawe, Studies on the Text of Sophocles, 3 vols., Leiden 1973-8.

R. D. Dawe, The end of *Seven against Thebes* yet again, in R. D. Dawe, J. Diggle, and P. E. Easterling (eds.), Dionysiaca. Nine Studies in Greek Poetry by Former Pupils presented to Sir Denys Page on his Seventieth Birthday (Cambridge 1978), 87-103.

R. D. Dawe (ed.), Sophoclis Electra, Stuttgart and Leipzig ^{3}1996.

R. D. Dawe (ed.), Sophoclis Oedipus Rex, Stuttgart and Leipzig ^{3}1996.

R. D. Dawe, On interpolations in the two Oedipus plays of Sophocles, RhM n.F. 144, 2001, 1-21.

R. D. Dawe, Pseudo-Aeschylus: *Agamemnon* 1630-73; *Eumenides* 24-26, Lexis 22, 2004, 117-27.

R. D. Dawe (ed., comm.), Sophocles. Oedipus Rex, Cambridge ^{1}1982, ^{2}2006.

R. D. Dawe, Corruption and Correction. A Collection of Articles, Amsterdam 2007.

R. Dawes, Miscellanea Critica, Cambridge 1745.

J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles, Oxford ^{1}1934, ^{2}1954 (rev. K. J. Dover).

L. G. van Deventer, Specimen Litterarium Inaugurale de Interpolationibus quibusdam in Sophoclis Tragoediis, diss. Leiden 1851.

J. Diggle (ed.), Euripidis Fabulae, vol. iii, Oxford 1994.

J. Diggle, Housman's Greek, in P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, and N. J. Richardson (eds.), Hesperos. Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday (Oxford 2007), 145-69.

E. Eicken-Iselin, Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zum Aufbau der Sophokleischen Rheseis, diss. Basel, Dortmund 1942.

F. Ellendt, Lexicon Sophocleum, Königsberg [1]1835, Berlin [2]1872 (rev. H. Genthe).

C. G. A. Erfurdt (ed., comm.), Sophoclis Oedipus Rex, Leipzig 1809.

P. J. Finglass (ed., comm.), Sophocles. Electra (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 44), Cambridge 2007.

P. J. Finglass, review of Dawe 2006, CB 83, 2007, 275-6.

P. J. Finglass, Laurentianus 31.10 and the text of Sophocles, CQ N.S. 58, 2008, 441-51.

P. J. Finglass, Unpublished conjectures at Leiden on the Greek dramatists, GRBS 49, 2009, 87-221.

A. F. Garvie (comm.), Aeschylus. Choephori, Oxford 1986.

P. L. W. Graffunder, Über den Ausgang des "König Oedipus" von Sophokles, Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik 132, 1885, 389-408.

M. Griffith (ed., comm.), Sophocles. Antigone, Cambridge 1999.

B. Heath, Notae sive lectiones ad Sophoclem, in Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque relliquias, Oxford 1762.

D. A. Hester, Oedipus and Jonah, PCPS N.S. 23, 1977, 32-61.

D. A. Hester, The banishment of Oedipus. A neglected theory on the end of the *Oedipus Rex*, Antichthon 18, 1984, 13-23.

R. C. Jebb (ed., transl., comm.), Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part I: The Oedipus Tyrannus, Cambridge [1]1883, [2]1887, [3]1893.

R. C. Jebb (ed., transl., comm.), Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part II: The Oedipus Coloneus, Cambridge [1]1885, [2]1889, [3]1900.

R. Kannicht and B. Snell (eds.), Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. Vol. 2. Fragmenta Adespota, Göttingen 1981.

P. D. Kovacs (ed., transl.), Euripides. Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba (Loeb Classical Library 484), Cambridge, MA and London 1995.

P. D. Kovacs (ed., transl.), Euripides. Bacchae. Iphigenia at Aulis. Rhesus (Loeb Classical Library 495), Cambridge, MA and London 2002.

R. Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre, 2 vols., rev. B. Gerth, Hannover and Leipzig [2]1898-1904.

P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones (ed., transl.), Sophocles. Ajax. Electra. Oedipus Tyrannus (Loeb Classical Library 20), Cambridge, MA and London 1994, 1997 (with revisions).

P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones (ed., transl.), Sophocles. Antigone. The Women of Trachis. Philoctetes. Oedipus at Colonus (Loeb Classical Library 21), Cambridge, MA and London 1994, 1998 (with revisions).

P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson (eds.), Sophoclis Fabulae, Oxford 1990, 1992 (with revisions).

P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, Sophoclea. Studies on the Text of Sophocles, Oxford 1990.

A. A. Long, Language and Thought in Sophocles. A Study of Abstract Nouns and Poetic Technique (University of London Classical Studies 6), London 1968.

O. Longo (ed.), Scholia Byzantina in Sophoclis Oedipum Tyrannum (Proagones 2), Padua 1971.

J. R. March, The Creative Poet. Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry (BICS Suppl. 49), London 1987.

J. Markland (ed., comm.), Euripidis Drama Supplices Mulieres, London 1763.

D. J. Mastronarde, Contact and Discontinuity. Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage (Univ. Cal. Publ. in Cl. Phil. 21), Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1979.

I. C. Matthiae, Quaestiones Sophocleae, Leipzig 1832.

P. Mazon: see under Dain.

C. W. Müller, Die Thebanische Trilogie des Sophokles und ihre Aufführung im Jahre 401. Zur Frühgeschichte der antiken Sophoklesrezeption und der Überlieferung des Textes, RhM n.F. 139, 1996, 193-224. [= (1999) 215-48]

C. W. Müller, Kleine Schriften zur antiken Literatur und Geistesgeschichte (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 132), Stuttgart and Leipzig 1999.

J. A. Nauck, Variae lectiones, Philologus 12, 1857, 634-49.

S. D. Olson, On the text of Sophocles *Oedipus Tyrannus* 1524-30, Phoenix 43, 1989, 189-95.

P. N. Papageorgius (ed.), Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera, Leipzig 1888.

A. C. Pearson (ed.), Sophoclis Fabulae, Oxford 1924.

F. Ritter, Sieben unechte schlussstellen in den tragödien des Sophokles, Philologus 17, 1861, 422-36.

F. H. Sandbach (ed.), Menandri reliquiae selectae, Oxford [1]1972, [2]1990.

F. W. Schneidewin, Die Sage vom Ödipus, Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (historich-philologische Classe) 5, 1853, 159-206.

F. W. Schneidewin (ed., comm.) Sophokles. Zweites Baendchen: Oedipus Tyrannos. Zweite Auflage, Berlin 1853.

F. W. Schneidewin (ed., comm.) Sophokles. Zweites Baendchen: Oedipus Tyrannos. Dritte Auflage besorgt von August Nauck, Berlin 1856.

E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik, 4 vols., Munich 1934-71 (rev. A. Debrunner).

G. Serra, La fine dell'*Edipo Re*, in G. Avezzù (ed.), Il dramma sofocleo. Testo, lingua, interpretazione (Drama: Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 13), Stuttgart and Weimar 2003, 321-39.

O. P. Taplin, Greek Tragedy in Action, London 1978.

W. Teuffel, Ueber den Schluß des sophokleischen König Oedipus, RhM n.F. 29, 1874, 505-9.

Voltaire, Troisieme Lettre, contenent la critique de l'Oedipe de Sophocle, in Oedipe. Tragédie, Paris 1719, 93-107.

J. Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax: mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch, 2 vols., Basel ^{1}1920-4, ^{2}1926-8.

E. Wunder (ed., comm.) Sophoclis Tragoediae. Vol. I. Sect. II. continens Oedipum Regem, Gotha and London ^{2}1840.